

REMARKS**Amendments to the Claims**

Applicants cancel system claims 9-16 and computer program product claims 17-24, leaving only method claims in the present application. In amending the claims in the present application, Applicants do not concede that the claims as originally filed were not in a condition for allowance nor do these cancellations represent a disclaimer of the recited subject matter. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue these cancelled system and product claims in one or more continuation applications. Applicants believe themselves entitled to pursue these claims in additional applications because the system and product claims are directed to an invention in a different statutory category than are the method claims that remain in this application. Applicants believe they are entitled to have claims directed to inventions in separate statutory categories issued in separate patents.

Applicants currently amend claim 1 in the present application to include limitations previously found in claim 3 of Applicants' original application. As such, claim 3 is canceled in this Response.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Bryan And Begel

Claims 1-24 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryan, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0146015) (hereafter, 'Bryan') in view of Begel, et al. ("SpeedNav: Document Navigation By Voice", University of California, Berkeley, October 9, 2002) (hereafter, 'Begel'). As discussed above, claims 9-24 are cancelled in this Response. The question of whether Applicants' remaining claims are obvious or not is examined in light of: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) any relevant secondary considerations, including commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, and failure of others. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, No. 04-1350, slip op. at 2 (U.S. April 30, 2007).

Although Applicants recognize that such an inquiry is an expansive and flexible one, the Office Action must nevertheless demonstrate a prima facie case of obviousness to reject Applicants' claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). *In re Khan*, 441 F.3d 977, 985-86 (Fed. Cir. 2006). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the proposed combination of Bryan and Begel must teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* § 2142 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974)). Independent claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method for creating a voice response grammar in a voice response server, the method comprising:

identifying a user for a presentation, the user having a user grammar, the user grammar including one or more user grammar elements for a content type, each user grammar element including an identifier of a structural element, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action, and a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action;

identifying presentation documents for the presentation, each presentation document having a content type;

selecting user grammar elements according to the content type of the identified presentation documents; and

storing a multiplicity of user grammar elements for the user in a voice response grammar on a voice response server, including storing the selected user grammar elements in the voice response grammar.

As discussed in more detail below, the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest each and every element and limitation of Applicants' claims. The cited combination of references therefore cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the claims of the present application.

**Bryan Does Not Teach Or Suggest
Identifying A User For A Presentation**

The Office Action takes the position that Bryan at paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0068, and Bryan's Abstract teaches or suggests the following limitation of claim 1: identifying a user for a presentation, the user having a user grammar, the user grammar including one or more user grammar elements for a content type, each user grammar element including an identifier of a structural element. Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that the Abstract of Bryan discloses creating, using, and updating individual user voice portals in a multi-user environment through grammars consisting of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware and software recognize for a particular user. Bryan at paragraph 0034 discloses that those audio macros are the words the listener assigns to access either a specific source or piece of information. As disclosed in Bryan at paragraph 0036, first time users may utilize Bryan's login module with a registration component to provide basic set-up information, and Bryan at paragraph 0068 discloses that each user is assigned a unique identifier that is used to associate that user with a particular voice portal. Bryan, at the reference points cited above and all other reference points in Bryan, however, does not disclose identifying a user for a presentation, the user having a user grammar, the user grammar including one or more user grammar elements, each user grammar element including an identifier of a structural element as claimed in the present application because Bryan does not disclose a user grammar as claimed in the present application. The claims of the present application recite that a grammar includes *one or more user grammar elements for a content type*, wherein each user grammar element includes, among other things, *an identifier of a structural element*. In contrast to the claims of the present application, Bryan at paragraph 0034 describes Bryan's grammars as merely a "set of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware and software must recognize for a

particular user.” Nowhere, however, does Bryan describe that Bryan’s grammars include *one or more user grammar elements for a content type* wherein each user grammar element includes, among other things, *an identifier of a structural element an identifier of a structural element*.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner states:

Further, appellant asserts BRYAN’S grammars merely being a “set of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware or software must recognize for a particular user.” The examiner asserts that appellant’s grammars are also merely a “set of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware or software must recognize for a particular user” that just happens to be directed toward document navigation.

Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that any assertion that Applicants’ user grammar is “also merely a set of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware or software must recognize for a particular user” stands in stark contradiction to what is claimed and disclosed in the present application. Claim 1 of the present application unambiguously states that the user grammar claimed in the present application includes “one or more user grammar elements for a content type, each user grammar element including an identifier of a structural element, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action, and a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.” That is, in the claim language itself, Applicants define a user grammar as much more than “a set of vocabulary words or audio macros that speech recognition hardware or software must recognize for a particular user.” Furthermore, in Applicants’ original specification Applicants disclose that a user grammar is a *data structure* that *includes* a set of key phrases that are used to select presentation action identifiers specific to a user for use in formulating presentation control instructions. That is, the set of key phrases used in formulating presentation control instructions are an element of a user grammar – not the user grammar itself. As such, any assertion that equates the user grammar claimed in the present application to Bryan’s grammar is simply not supported by the claims or specification in the present case. In fact, such an assertion contradicts what is claimed and disclosed in the present application. Because

Bryan never once teaches that Bryan's set of vocabulary words include an identifier of a structural element, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action, or a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action, Bryan's grammar cannot reasonably be viewed as teaching or suggesting the user grammar claimed in the present application.

Because Bryan does not teach the limitations against which it is cited, the combination of Bryan and Begel does not teach or suggest each and every element and limitation of claim 1 of the present application. The combination of Bryan and Begel therefore cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 1 of the present application. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should therefore be withdrawn and the claim should be allowed.

**Bryan Does Not Teach Or Suggest Selecting User
Grammar Elements According To The Content
Type Of The Identified Presentation Documents**

Claim 1 of the present application is amended to include the following limitation previously recited in claim 3 of Applicants' original application: selecting user grammar elements according to the content type of the identified presentation documents. In rejecting former claim 3, the Office Action takes the position that the above recited limitation is taught by Bryan at paragraph 0062. Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that what Bryan at paragraph 0062 actually discloses is:

[0062] According to an important aspect of the invention, topic radio engine 104 presents one or more templates to each user to collect information from the user regarding information sources, search keywords, search time windows, and audio macros for accessing search results. In the illustrated embodiment, these templates are stored in topic radio template database 108. The particular template presented to an individual user may depend on the type of user. For example, if the user is a cardiologist, the template may contain lists of medical journals from which information may be extracted. Alternatively or in addition to user-tailored templates, users may be presented with generic templates, such as news templates, weather templates, sports templates, etc., that allow users to define audio macros and data sources for these categories of information. In another example, if the user is an individual investor, the template may contain stock information and allow the user to select stock

information to be included in his or her voice portal. If the user is a company, the template may allow the user to select from information provided on the company's web site. Once the user completes the templates, the template is stored in topic radio template database 108 and used in providing a unique voice portal for a particular user.

That is, Bryan at the cited reference point teaches providing templates to each user to collect information from the user regarding information sources, search keywords, search time windows, and audio macros for accessing search results. Bryan further discloses that such templates may be generic or tailored to the individual user. Bryan's templates, however, neither teach nor suggest selecting user grammar elements according to the content type of the identified presentation documents as claimed in the present application for two reasons. First, Bryan does not teach or suggest selecting user grammar elements. Second, Bryan does not teach or suggest presentation documents with associated content types.

Bryan does not teach or suggest selecting user grammar elements as claimed in the present application. Claim 1 of the present application explicitly recites that a user grammar element is selected. A user grammar element, as claimed in the present application, includes an identifier of a structural element, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action, and a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action. As discussed above, Bryan does not teach or suggest anything remotely related to a user grammar element which includes an identifier of a structural element, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action, and a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action. In fact, the cited reference point provides a wholly unrelated teaching to what is claimed in the present application – the cited reference teaches collecting user information through the use of a template so that a voice portal can be created for a user search specified data sources and subsequently access search results. In contrast, the limitation above claims the selection of a user grammar element in accordance with the content type of a presentation document. Because Bryan does not teach or suggest selecting user grammar elements, Bryan cannot possibly teach or suggest *selecting user grammar elements* according to the content type of the identified presentation documents as claimed in the present application.

In addition to the fact that Bryan does not teach or suggest selecting user grammar elements, Bryan also fails to teach or suggest presentation documents with associated content types. The “content type” of the identified presentation document refers to the actual format of the document itself. Applicants original specification at page 12, lines 8-20, states that identifying the content type may be carried out, for example, by identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension in the filename of an original document. Examples of filename extension identifying content type include ‘pdf’ for Adobe’s Portable Document Format, ‘xls’ for a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, ‘doc’ for a word processing document, ‘xml’ for an XML document. Alternatively, identifying the content type may be carried out by identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements in an original document.

In rejecting the claim limitation recited above, the Office Action includes the following text from paragraph 0062: *‘that allow users to define audio macros and data sources for these categories of information.’* Presumably, the Office Action is asserting that the ‘categories of information’ disclosed by Bryan teach or suggest the content type of the identified presentation documents as claimed in the present application. In fact, the ‘categories of information’ taught in Bryan refer to the *subject matter* of the content being searched. Bryan, for example, identifies stock reports and weather reports as exemplary ‘categories of information.’ See, Bryan at paragraph 0012. That is, a category of information is determined by the subject matter that the information relates to – not the particular format type of the content. As such, the cited reference point cannot be said to teach or suggest presentation documents with associated content types. Because Bryan does not teach or suggest presentation documents with associated content types, Bryan cannot possibly teach or suggest selecting user grammar elements *according to the content type of the identified presentation documents* as claimed in the present application.

Because Bryan does not teach the limitations against which it is cited, the combination of Bryan and Begel does not teach or suggest each and every element and limitation of claim 1 of the present application. The combination of Bryan and Begel therefore cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 1 of the present application. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should therefore be withdrawn and the claim should be allowed.

Relations Among Claims

Claims 2 and 4-8 depend from independent claim 1. Each dependent claim includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Because the combination of Bryan and Begel cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 1 of the present application, the combination of Bryan and Begel cannot possibly be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the dependent claims of the present application. The rejections of claims 2 and 4-8 therefore should be withdrawn, and these claims also should be allowed.

Conclusion


Claims 1-2 and 4-8 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Bryan and Begel. The combination of Bryan and Begel does not teach or suggest each and every element and limitation of the claims in the present application. As such, the combination of Bryan and Begel cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the claims of the present application. Claims 1-2 and 4-8 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-2 and 4-8.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 16, 2008

By: _____


H. Artoush Ohanian

Reg. No. 46,022

Biggers & Ohanian, LLP

P.O. Box 1469

Austin, Texas 78767-1469

Tel. (512) 472-9881

Fax (512) 472-9887

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS